

17th March 1931]

Forests

Assignment of reserved forest area in Omalur taluk.

* 629 Q.—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether petitions have been received from the ryots of Omalur taluk in Salem district for the assignment of land in reserved forest area for cultivation; and

(b) if so, with what result?

A.—Petitions have been received from the ryots of Bommidi and adjacent villages for the assignment of 1,045 acres of land in the Mallapuram and Mallapuram Extension reserved forests in the Omalur and Uttangarai taluks of the Salem district. The Government have decided to disforest and assign the area for cultivation. An area of 551 acres has already been disforested and the Board of Revenue has been instructed to take steps for the survey and assignment of that area. The remaining portion will be disforested after the forest department has removed the existing tree growth in the area.

Jails

Appeal by Mr. N. Damodaram for remission of sentence.

* 630 Q.—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have remitted a portion of the sentence of two years passed by the Madras High Court in Sessions Case No. 9 on one C. G. Dumaine, and released him; if so, what is the term of sentence thus remitted and for what reasons;

(b) whether the Government are aware that along with C. G. Dumaine, one N. Damodaram was also convicted in the same case for the same term of imprisonment and for the same offence;

(c) whether N. Damodaram has appealed to the Government to remit the unexpired portion of the sentence passed on him;

(d) what orders Government have passed on that petition; and

(e) if the Government have declined to remit the sentence as desired, what are the reasons which influenced the Government to do so, while they have released the co-accused in the said case?

A.—(a) Yes. The portion of the sentence remitted amounted to about one year. The sentence was remitted in view of the old age of Dumaine and the facts, throwing doubt on his guilt, brought to notice in the Judgment in C.S. No. 265 of 1928 on the file of the High Court.

(b) Yes, but the evidence against Damodaram was different from that against Dumaine.

(c) Yes.

(d) The Government decline to interfere with the sentence passed on him.